

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

SALIFU JATTA,

CASE NO. 3:22 CV 114

Petitioner,

v.

JUDGE JAMES R. KNEPP II

MERRICK GARLAND, et al.,

Respondents.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND
ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Amanda M. Knapp's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") to dismiss Petitioner Salifu Jatta's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (Doc. 9). Specifically, Judge Knapp recommends the Court dismiss the Petition seeking release from immigration detention pending Petitioner's removal from the country due to Petitioner's release from said detention on April 4, 2022. *Id.*

Under the relevant statute:

Within fourteen days of being served with a copy [of a Magistrate Judge's R&R], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file timely written objections to a Magistrate Judge's R&R constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review by the district court of any issues covered in the R&R. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 814-15 (6th Cir. 1984); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

In this case, the R&R was issued on May 4, 2022, and it is now May 23, 2022. Petitioner has neither filed objections nor requested an extension of time to file them. Despite the lack of

objections, the Court has reviewed Judge Knapp's R&R, and agrees with the findings and recommended ruling therein. Therefore, the Court ADOPTS Judge Knapp's R&R (Doc. 9) as the Order of this Court, and DISMISSES Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Petition (Doc. 1) as moot set forth therein. The Court certifies, pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and finds there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability, 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); FED. R. APP. P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James R. Knepp II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE